



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,915	07/10/2003	Jerome James Workman JR.	26069-526 CIP	4223
30623	7590	03/16/2006	EXAMINER	
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111			SCHUBERG, LAURA J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1651		

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/617,915	WORKMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laura Schuberg	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-53 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, 20-22, drawn to a method for measuring *in vivo* blood glucose levels, classified in class 435, subclass 14.
- II. Claims 10-18, drawn to a skin sensor composition, classified in class 430, subclass 82 for example.
- III. Claims 19, 23-43, drawn to a method for monitoring concentration of metabolites or analytes, classified in class 604, subclass 504 for example.
- IV. Claims 44-46, drawn to a sensor system, classified in class 600, subclass 310.
- V. Claims 47-48, drawn to a method for determining blood glucose concentration, classified in class 604, subclass 100.02 for example.
- VI. Claims 49-51,53, drawn to a method of calculating a blood glucose concentration, classified in class 436, subclass 57 for example.
- VII. Claim 52, drawn to a method for determining the concentration of a metabolite or analyte in skin tissue, classified in class 424, subclass 9.6 for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the

process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as a cosmetic product for dyeing of keratin fibres.

Inventions I, III, and V-VII are directed to methods that are physically distinct in that they require different method steps and are not required one for the other. Invention I requires measuring *in vivo* blood glucose levels while Inventions V-VII do not. Invention III requires the penetration of a skin sensor composition to a depth of about 10 um that inventions I, V and VI do not. Invention VII requires irradiating an agent with a source of electromagnetic radiation that Inventions I, III and V-VI do not. Invention V requires performing an instrument response measurement that Inventions I, III and VI-VII do not. Therefore, a search and examination of all five methods in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the searches for the methods are not co-extensive, the classification is different, and the subject matter is divergent.

Inventions IV and Inventions I, III and V-VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are drawn to an apparatus and five methods that do not necessarily use the apparatus. There are limitations within Invention IV (e.g. components, applicators and an air interface) that are not recited in the methods of Inventions I, III and V-VII.

Inventions II and I, V-VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are drawn to a composition and four methods that do not necessarily prepare or use the composition. There are limitations within Invention II (e.g. combined reporter and marker dye) that are not recited in the methods of Inventions I, V-VII.

Inventions II and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the sensor system of Invention IV can be operated with a different skin sensor composition than Invention II. The subcombination has separate utility such as its use in Invention III with a different system such as an optical reader.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Burden consists not only of specific searching of classes and subclasses, but also of searching multiple databases for foreign references and literature searches. Burden also resides in the examination of independent claim sets for clarity, enablement and double patenting issues.

Claims 9,14,18,27,37 and 43 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: lactate; hydrogen ion (H⁺); calcium ion (Ca²⁺) pumping rate; (Mg²⁺) pumping rate; sodium ion (Na⁺) pumping rate; potassium ion (K⁺) pumping rate; adenosine triphosphate (ATP); adenosine diphosphate (ADP); the ratio of ATP to ADP; inorganic phosphate (Pi); glycogen, pyruvate; nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate, oxidized form (NAD(P)⁺); nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (phosphate), reduced form (NAD(P)H); flavin adenine dinucleotide, oxidized form (FAD); flavin adenine dinucleotide, reduced form (FADH₂); and oxygen (O₂) utilization.

Claims 11 and 33 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: a mitochondrial vital stain or dye; a dye exhibiting redox potential; a dye exhibiting energy transfer properties; a dye exhibiting a pH gradient.

Claims 12, 25, and 35 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: rhodamine 123; di-4-ANEPPS; di-8-ANEPPS; DiBAC4(3); RH421; tetramethylrhodamine ethyl ester, perchlorate; tetramethylrhodamine methyl ester, perchlorate; 2-(4-(dimethylamino)styryl)-N-ethylpyridinium iodide; 3,3'-dihexyloxacarbocyanine, 5,5',6,6'-tetrachloro-1,1',3,3' tetraethylbenzimidazolylcarbocyanine chloride; 5,5',6,6'-tetrachloro-1,1',3,3' -tetraethylbenzimidazolylcarbocyanine iodide; nonylacridine orange; dihydrorhodamine 123 dihydrorhodamine 123, dihydrochloride salt; xanthene; 2',7'-bis-(2-carboxyethyl)-5-(and-6)-carboxyfluorescein; benzenedicarboxylic acid; 2(or 4)-[10-(dimethylamino)-3-oxo-3-H-benzo[c]xanthene-7-yl]; and iodine dissolved in potassium iodide.

Claims 13, 26, 36 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: coumarin; derivatives of coumarin, anthraquinones; cyanine dyes, azo dyes; xanthene dyes; arylmethine dyes; pyrene derivatives; and ruthenium bipyridyl complexes.

Claim 29 is generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: electroporation, laser poration, sonic poration, ultrasonic poration, iontophoresis, mechanical-poration, solvent transport, tattooing, wicking, pressurized delivery.

Claims 31 and 41 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: at least 24-48 hours, at least 2-6 hours, from about 5 seconds to 5 minutes, from about 30 seconds to 5 minutes.

The species are independent or distinct because none would render any other species within that genus obvious. In addition, considering enablement, utility, and description issues for each claimed species, as well as conducting a thorough search of the prior art for each and every combination embodied by the present claims, would pose a serious burden to the examiner.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura Schuberg whose telephone number is 571-272-3347. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Laura Schuberg

SANDRA E. SAUCIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sandra E. Saucier". The signature is enclosed within a stylized, roughly circular, hand-drawn oval.